



Education and Globalization in Europe: Current Trends and Future Developments

Hans de Wit

Introduction

THIS ARTICLE provides an overview of, and suggests the reasons behind, the developments in internationalisation of higher education in Europe. In the conclusions, some comparative observations on developments in Europe and the United States will be presented.'

In the late 1960s the internationalisation of higher education was still a rather restricted phenomenon in Europe. Although, since those days, the transnationalisation of higher education has become one of the priorities in educational policy, in particular but not exclusively thanks to ERASMUS and other EC programs, internationalisation in the sense of institutional change is still in an initial phase. And the changes are taking place in an uneven and piecemeal way. Internationalisation of higher education in Europe will still have to overcome enormous obstacles in reaching a stage in which it is no longer an ad hoc phenomenon imposed upon higher education from the outside, but a natural and integral part of its mission, its plans, and its academic programs.

In general terms, we define internationalisation as the complex of processes whose combined effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions. ² Formal definitions aside, the perception and definition of internationalisation is influenced and to a large extent constructed by the role and viewpoint of the various stakeholders in education: the European Commission, government, the private sector, institution, faculty, and student.

For an understanding of the European situation, it is important to recognize the diversity of routes through which the concept of 'inter-nationalisation' is emerging and coming to be recognized as an accepted goal for institutions, governments, and national or regional academic structures. The process is far from uniform or consistent; and in some national systems of higher education the idea of internationalisation as a process does not fit easily or naturally. The emergence of explicit strategies for internationalisation, visibly supported by policy statements and the commitment of resources, is only part of the picture and takes place under many different circumstances and imperatives.

Research on internationalisation of higher education in Europe is even more recent and fragmented than internationalisation in itself. Much existing research focuses on student mobility as the most accessible and quantifiable index of internationalisation, at the expense of less readily researchable but equally significant indicators such as curricular and organizational change. While the tradition of research into academic mobility and international education is longer and more established in the United States, much of it is of limited relevance to Europe. As

Teichler notes:

In European countries, research on academic mobility was undertaken only on a very small scale prior to the 1970s and addressed almost exclusively issues of students and staff from developing countries. Later on a substantial amount of the research available addresses pragmatically the driving rationale of the programs for international cooperation and mobility, initiated by the European Community. Irrespective of the countries involved, most of the research available on academic mobility and international education seems to be occasional, Ozaczdental, sporadic or episodic. 3

Consequently much of the research material available on Europe has characteristics of an emergent discipline in its 'preparadigmatic phase': by which is meant a stage of development at which many excellent single studies are being conducted.

Sources of Diversity

As already stated in the introduction, in our analysis of institutional strategies we have to keep in mind that Europe is not a homogeneous region; still less is its education homogeneous. This implies that when analyzing internationalisation of higher education in Europe, we have to take account of several important issues, such as regional differences, diversity of language, different educational traditions and systems, diversity of stakeholders, and the coexistence of universities and a strong non-university sector.

Also, it is important to realize that internationalisation in Europe is still in development. Characterizing the environment in which higher education operates in the United States in its effect on internationalisation, Elaine El-Khawas mentions four important points:

- There is no national, governmental policy that guides campus action.
- The main sources of advice and guidance for campus action are private.
- The actions of each college and university with respect to international activity depend, to a substantial extent, on the decisions of institutional leaders.
- International activities, by and large, must depend on self-financing mechanisms. For Europe, until recently, to a large extent one could posit the opposite of these four characteristics:
- Institutional strategies and actions have been initiated mainly by support provided by the European Commission and-although in a more limited way-by national governments.
- Private initiative and support for internationalisation is almost negligible in Europe.
- The role of institutional leaders in the process of internationalisation has been less initiating and more reactive than in the United States.
- Internationalisation of higher education in Europe has been developed more on the basis of financial support by the European Commission and national governments than it has been based on self-financing mechanisms, which were and in many cases still are absent, both at the institutional level and individually.

But a shift is taking place, although not to the extent reached in the United States, in the direction of

- more autonomous institutional strategies for internationalisation, which are less dependent on governmental support

- a growing involvement of private support in addition to public subsidies for internationalisation
- more active institutional leadership instead of reactive policies
- the creation of more self-financing mechanisms, at both the institutional and individual levels. Once again we must emphasize the uneven scale and pace of this

The Role of the European Commission in Internationalisation in Europe

The stimulus for internationalisation in Europe has come in particular from the European Commission, the main original reason being a fear on the part of the European Commission that Europe would lose the technological race with the United States and in particular Japan, unless science and technology were stimulated at a European level.

The European Commission now stresses the importance of international cooperation and exchange in higher education from a political and cultural point of view, and emphasizes the need for the creation of a European identity: a 'citizenship of Europe'. While the Commission has played an active role in stimulating and supporting intra-Community educational mobility and cooperation for a number of years, its legal competence in the educational field dates only from the adoption of the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993.

One may say that the intention of the European Commission is to stimulate internationalisation of higher education in Europe in order to contribute to European economic growth and to spread a European unity through cooperation in research and education. The "added value" of Community action in the sphere of education is according to the Commission, in the words of its president, Jacques Delors,

the mutual integration and opening up to each other of general education and professional training systems are an economic issue, in terms of maintaining competitiveness, and a political issue, in terms of defending democracy and human rights. 5

The European Association for International Education (EAIE), in a comment on the Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community, acknowledges the positive role of the European Commission in stimulating internationalisation of higher education within Europe, but at the same time questions the confusion of internationalisation with Europeanization:

For the European Commission, the main focus of internationalisation is Europeanization: achievement of European excellence; strengthening of Europe's position in the global economy; safeguarding and strengthening Europe's cultural heritage; strengthening the basis for further political development and for European Political Union; a European Community dimension in higher education; the European dimension of curricula.

The EAIE points to the danger of an Eurocentric view of internationalisation and (citing Peter Scott) sees a potential contradiction between Europeanization and internationalisation:

Intra-European exchanges cannot be regarded as fully 'international'. Indeed, as the European Community deepens and widens, they will increasingly be seen as 'internal' rather than 'external' exchanges. Nor can they be regarded as a substitute for wider global relations.

Although, as we shall see, the EC is playing an important part in the globalization of academic

cooperation and exchange, it does not altogether escape this criticism of a disproportionate Eurocentrism in its view of international education. The European Commission, despite its crucial and dominant role, is not the only stakeholder influencing the development of internationalisation in Europe. In general, there lacks any common view among stakeholders about the 'what', the 'why', and the 'how' of internationalisation. Within Europe, a great diversity of arguments, social, economic, and educational, are deployed to support the internationalisation of education. Some of these arguments have their origin in the needs of society and/or the economy, some in the needs of education itself. Together they constitute a set of overlapping rationales for the process and activities of internationalisation. In turn, they form the basis of the incentives for internationalisation that are perceived by stakeholders, and the justifications that are made internally and externally. And, as has been said before, there is potential coincidence, but also conflict, between the interests of the different stakeholders: international governments, the private sector, institutions, departments, faculty, and students.

The Historical Context

To understand the European situation, it is essential to place current developments in a historical dimension. Many authors have commented on macrohistorical changes affecting educational mobility and cooperation: the creation of nation-states in the nineteenth century and earlier; Europe's historical role in the world, in particular its role in colonialization and in the process of decolonization; the impact of higher education in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom on higher education in the rest of the world; recent trends in European integration; the collapse of the former Soviet Union and associated East-West rapprochement; recession and financial constraint; "massification" of higher education; the dissolution of some structures and blocs and the emergence of others. Institutions, as they participate in these events, bring with them their own microhistories-their individual biographies, which may stretch back many centuries or reflect a far more recent foundation. An institution's response to the 'push' and 'pull' factors for internationalisation will always reflect the intersection of these micro- and macrolevel histories.

Confining discussion to the macrolevel, the 1960s in Europe are not seen today as a period of internationalisation-more reference is made to the Renaissance times of the Dutch philosopher Erasmus. But it would be entirely wrong to believe that international student mobility was absent then.

In general, the period 1950-1970 was, according to Baron, characterized by a "foreign policy" among receiving countries of "benevolent laissez-faire": of open doors to foreign students-students, who to a large extent, came from the former and, at that time, still existing French and British colonies. Some elements of this are still seen in the pattern of student flow to these countries, although (in the British case especially) the impact of more recent policies has largely transformed the picture. According to Baron, in the period 1950-1970

promoting academic mobility was predominantly seen as an element of foreign policy. From the point of view of the receiving countries, provision and care for foreign students were perceived as connected to foreign policy objectives, such as maintaining political influence with future elites in other countries and preparing useful contacts for international relations in commerce and industry. 9

Guy Neave, of the International Association of Universities (IAU), sees massification of the student flow and its bipolar nature (the dominance of the United States in the Western bloc and of the former Soviet Union in the communist bloc) as the main characteristics of internationalisation in the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁰ The open door and laissez-faire policy and the one-way dimension were the other characteristics of the process of internationalisation of higher

education, at a global level and in Europe in particular. The universities themselves played a mainly passive role as receivers of foreign students. Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl gives the following characteristics of internationalisation in Europe before the introduction of the European programs: historical ties with former colonies (usually combined with cultural and linguistic ties); political considerations; presence of political refugees; economic considerations; educational demands; research cooperation in the natural sciences; top-level postgraduate study; migration of "guest workers"; increasing foreign language competence at school level; traditional links between disciplines (mainly philology); traditional mobility of elites; improvement of transport and communication and expansion of tourism; cooperation at postgraduate level between Western Europe and the United States; mobility of Third world students and staff to Western Europe (brain drain).P>

Although this list looks impressive, the effects of these factors on higher education cooperation within Europe were marginal. International activity was mainly oriented toward the cooperation of European higher education with the United States (outward mobility) and with the Third World (inward mobility). A European policy for internationalisation did not exist.

The 1980s produced two distinct changes: first, in the open door mobility of individual students; and second, in student mobility as an integrated part of the study at home.

Individual Mobility

With respect to the individual mobility of students, the European nations and universities began changing their benevolent laissez-faire policy to a more controlled reception and in some cases the active recruitment of fee-paying foreign students. Alice Chandler, in a study in 1989 published by the Institute for International Education, stated:

What has changed in recent years is the balance of motives. Humanitarianism and internationalism still exist as rationales for foreign student enrollments. But they have been overshadowed in both rhetoric and reality during the 1980s by the increased emphasis on pragmatics: by the monies to be derived from foreign student tuitions, by the purchases and expenditures made by foreign student tuitions, by the purchases and expenditures made by foreign student tuitions, by the purchases and expenditures made by foreign students as tourists, and by the less measurable but ultimately even more important contribution to be made by foreign graduates as future financial and diplomatic allies.

The best example of that change was the British decision in 1979 to introduce "full-cost fees" for foreign students. Higher education as an export commodity quickly became dominant in the United Kingdom, as it already was in the United States.

For most people on the European continent, to consider the education of foreign students as an export commodity is still an anathema. On the European continent, the reception of foreign students is still based more on foreign policy arguments than on considerations of export policy. Often, it can fairly be claimed that foreign students cost more money, owing to the subsidy of higher education, than they generate. This was also the case in the former communist countries such as the Soviet Union, where students were received for ideological reasons but now are no longer welcome because of the high costs to their hosts' faltering economies.

It is not unlikely that, in the coming decade, the international movement of students as an export commodity will also spread over the European continent and will become a more important element of higher education policy than it has been in the past, both at the national and at the institutional levels. Examples of this new focus can already been seen, for instance, in the

Netherlands. A recent policy document of the Dutch government declares the recruitment of foreign students to be a policy issue and announces the introduction of full-cost fees for non-European Union students. This is a remarkable change away from the past two decades, when national policy aimed at discouraging foreign students from study in the Netherlands.

Other examples can be seen in Central and Eastern Europe, where universities develop programs for foreign students, in order to attract the foreign currency that is so important for their infrastructure because of lack of sufficient national support. An important market is the children of former emigrants to the United States, who see the relatively cheap training in their countries of origin as an alternative to the high costs of academic training in the United States.

The EC Mobility programs

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the notion of "study abroad", in the sense of sending students to foreign institutions of higher education as part of their home degree program, became an issue that overshadowed the developments in individual mobility of students. From the 1980s to the present student mobility as a one-way, individual process stimulated by political and/or economic considerations has (with the exception of the United Kingdom) lost prominence as a policy issue. It has been marginalized by the greater attention given to student mobility in the framework of exchange programs, which have been among the top priorities in higher education policies in the 1980s and 1990s.

Before this period, managed programs for exchanges of students and staff did exist, such as the Fulbright program in the United States and the bilateral cultural and academic agreements of European countries. But these programs were limited in both funding and scope, stimulating mainly unrelated exchanges at postgraduate level. In the 1970s, more structural exchange stimulating programs were established, first in Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany. These programs were inspired by the development of study abroad programs of American universities in Europe in the same period, but the German and Swedish schemes distinguished themselves from their American examples by the fact that they were much more focused on integration of their own students in the foreign host universities, where the American programs were more isolated satellites of the American home institution.

In 1976, the Council of the European Communities adopted an action program for education. This was the first such move, since the Treaty of Rome did not mention education as an area for community action. The Commission had to justify its action program by non-educational, mainly economic criteria. But the action program of 1976 was the basis for future activities in academic cooperation and exchange within the European Community. And, ironically, the lack of a legal basis for action in the field of higher education gave the European Commission a great deal of freedom for creative action: a freedom and creativity that would have been less within a more formal structure.

In 1976, the Joint Study programs scheme was established by the Commission, aimed at "the promotion of joint programs of study and research between institutions in several member states". The focus of this experimental program was primarily the stimulation of academic mobility within the EC. The program grew gradually from thirty-two projects in 1976-1977 to two hundred in 1983-1984, with a budget of 700.000 ECU. In 1984, the Commission added a budget line for student grants into the Joint Study programs Scheme. This scheme was replaced in 1987 by its successor, the "European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students": ERASMUS.

The rationale behind ERASMUS was primarily political and economic: to stimulate a European

identity; and to develop international competitiveness through education. Thus ERASMUS and the other educational programs as such are a logical addition to the Research and Development programs launched by the European Community to keep up with Japan and the United States in the technological race.

These programs have gradually been opened to the countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Austria-and to Switzerland. The Scandinavians created their own mobility program, Nordplus, to stimulate inter-Scandinavian mobility and cooperation in higher education. With the coming inclusion in the European Union of the first three of these countries, the educational programs will become even more European.

Since the implementation of the ERASMUS program in 1987, significant results have been achieved in cooperation and exchange within higher education and between higher education and industry in the European Union. The following is an overview of those results, based on a number of sources.

Thanks to ERASMUS, in the period 1987-1993, more than 200.000 students and 15.000 faculty have been exchanged. This took place in the framework of 2.200 Joint Study programs, in which 14.000 departments of 1.300 institutions of higher education work together. In addition, 700 intensive courses and 800 joint curricula have been established; 20.000 short visits of faculty and administrators have been supported; and 100 European faculty and 30 student organizations have been given a subsidy to stimulate their activities.

In the year 1993-1994 almost 48.000 students have been exchanged, and more than 8.000 lecturers have participated in staff mobility programs, illustrating the rapid growth of this program.

New Developments

The European Commission, confronted with the fast-growing interest in its educational programs, conscious of the new role of education under the Maastricht Treaty and aware of a positive change of attitude in the institutions of higher education toward its educational programs, has finalized the necessary preparations for the follow up of the mobility programs, since 31 December 1994 was the expiry date of the present phase.

In 1991, the European Commission published the white paper mentioned above, the "Memorandum on Higher Education in the European community". This document was the basis for an intensive debate on the role of the European Union in education and on the future of the educational programs. Although in general it was well received, critical comments were made by the educational sector on the one-sided focus by the European Commission on economic and political criteria at the expense of a broader cultural and academic approach.

In 1993 Antonio Ruberti, commissioner for education and research, published a new discussion paper, in which he stressed the importance of a more coherent continuation of the existing programs (combining ERASMUS and LINGUA into one program) and a closer link between these and the Research and Development programs of the European Union. Based on that document, on 4 January 1994 the European Commission presented a new program, called SOCRATES. This is an umbrella program covering three areas: higher education, school education and other transverse measures (promotion of linguistic skills, open and distance learning, information promotion). In addition to SOCRATES, Commissioner Ruberti also announced a five-year program for action in the field of vocational training, called LEONARDO (after Leonardo da Vinci). Characteristic of this new approach is the extension of educational

policy from higher education to secondary and vocational education (although some smaller programs in the latter field already existed, such as PETRA, FORCE and IRIS, now incorporated in LEONARDO). LEONARDO will include many aspects of the former COMETT program, such as internships for students in higher vocational training; but its main focus is on innovation in secondary vocational training.

Within SOCRATES, for the area of school teaching, a budget is set aside to encourage the setting up of partnerships between secondary schools for carrying out joint educational projects, in particular in the area of languages, cultural heritage, and environmental protection. The promotion of schooling of immigrant and gypsy children and the skills updating of educational staff will be part of the "Europe at School" program in SOCRATES.

1.

1. For higher education, ERASMUS will continue as the program for promoting mobility of students and staff. Disciplinary and institutional networking will be the basis of the next phase of ERASMUS. An important element of the new ERASMUS scheme will be that institutions, instead of departments as hitherto, will now be the main actors working together in curriculum development and staff and student exchange through the Joint Study programs. Institutions will be eligible to receive a contract from the Commission, based on concrete proposals for mobility of staff and students, joint curricula, intensive courses, credit transfer, distance education, and language preparation. Under the new scheme institutions will have to prove that they have a well-defined policy and budget for international cooperation, before being awarded a contract. This change of responsibility for the administration of the partnerships from the academic coordinator to the institutional administrator is intended to make it possible for the faculty to concentrate on the academic aspects of internationalisation while the administrator will handle the administrative part. This change recognizes the new role of the institution, its rights and obligations, in internationalisation. It can also be read as a recognition of the growing professionalism of the institutional administrator in internationalisation.

2. The Impact of the EC in Other Areas

The role of the European Commission in higher education has not been limited to educational mobility and exchange within the European Union. Four other areas may be mentioned in which the EC has played an important part in stimulating internationalisation of higher education.

1. The Research and Development programs

1. Internationalisation of research is a phenomenon that is already generally accepted. International joint ventures of research groups are no longer exceptional, and there is a long tradition of conferences, seminars, work-shops, and congresses for academic exchange of ideas and findings. On the other hand the technological needs of modern society demand very expensive research projects that individual research groups, institutions of higher education, companies, or even national governments cannot finance alone. Therefore a logical role exists for the European Commission in stimulating international cooperation in science and research in the Community.

Such a stimulation policy was in existence several years before the moves took place to establish a general education policy in the EC. In 1979 an early stimulus toward the R&D research policy was provided with the establishment of the European Strategic

Program for Research and Development in Information Technology (ESPRIT), followed by programs such as RACE (communication technology), BRITE (industrial technology), SPRINT (innovation and technology transfer), and ECLAIR (linkages between agriculture and industry).

Since 1984 most of the programs have taken place within so called Framework programs, the first running from 1984 to 1987, the second from 1987 to 1991. the third from 1990 to 1994 and the fourth from 1993 to 1997.

Although the R&D programs are more substantial in terms of quality and funding than the educational programs of the European Commission, they are widely considered to be less closely related to internationalisation strategies than are the educational programs. R&D funding is seen as just one additional resource for large research projects, in a area that is in itself already so global that individual, institutional, and even national research projects are more exception than rule.

2. Cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe

The opening up of Central and Eastern Europe has had an enormous impact on higher education in this region and on cooperation between institutions of higher education in Western, Central, and Eastern Europe. As Denis Kallen makes clear, academic cooperation and exchange already existed before this opening up and was developing rapidly in the 1980s, in particular with Poland and Hungary. Cooperation concentrated mainly on staff exchanges and far less on student exchanges. From the point of view of the regimes in these countries, academic cooperation was mainly a political issue and little institutional or personal autonomy was possible. (13)

Although, as Ladislav Cerych states, the opening up of Central and Eastern Europe had a global effect, the increase in academic mobility with Western Europe was quantitatively greater than with any other area. Regional proximity and the political push by national governments and the European Commission formed the basis for this strong inner-European academic cooperation. (14)

The European Commission, through its so-called PHARE program, opened the way for several forms of cooperation, both in R&D and in education. The best-known example is the Trans European Mobility Program for University Studies (TEMPUS), which provides support for the development of education by way of mobility grants for students and faculty and infrastructural support.

TEMPUS covers ten countries in Central and Eastern Europe, excluding the republics of the former Soviet Union, for which region in 1993 a new scheme, TEMPUS-TACIS, has been established. The impact has been enormous. In TEMPUS, some 750 projects have been implemented since the program's start in 1990, including more than 1.800 institutions of higher education, companies, and organizations. Up to 1993 around 6.500 students had been granted the opportunity to study in Western Europe, and some 10.000 staff members have gone to Central and Eastern Europe.

Thanks to TEMPUS and other programs supported by national governments and other international private and public organizations, a rapid improvement in the educational infrastructure and of the quality of education has been achieved. One of the main problems still to be solved is the brain drain of qualified faculty and

students. But although this and many other large problems remain to be solved, an important step forward in bridging the gap between higher education in Western and Central and Eastern Europe has been made. In the field of R&D, also, thanks to the support of the EC and national governments, the situation in Central and Eastern Europe is better than it was ten years ago.

There is ground for some concern in the lack of cooperation among the institutions of higher education in the Central and Eastern European countries themselves, and, related to that problem, a tendency toward nationalist instead of regional approaches. Another cause of concern is the growing tendency in programs for Central and Eastern Europe to give almost exclusive priority to the hard disciplines, seen as directly related to economic development, at the expense of the "vulnerable sector" and disciplines in higher education. Further concern lies in the one-way direction of mobility and cooperation. Only recently has a small but growing stream of students begun to move from West to East. If higher education in Central and Eastern Europe is to escape from its dependence on support from Western Europe, then a relationship of two-way exchange and cooperation must prevail. The extension of the ERASMUS scheme and other EC programs for higher education to Poland and Hungary, and gradually to the other ten countries participating in the TEMPUS scheme, would be an important contribution to the autonomous development of higher education in that region, and (as was the case with the EFTA countries) an excellent case study for their future participation in the European Union as a whole.

3. Toward a Global Approach

Timothy Light, questioning the American supremacy in higher education, argues that there is a shift from a one-way relationship of higher education in the United States to the rest of the world, into a two-way, "twinning" relationship. (15)

He, like many other authors, considers the European programs important contributors to this development. The ERASMUS program has been the example for similar projects between the European Community and the rest of the world. These include extension of the ERASMUS, LINGUA, and COMETT programs to the so-called EFTA countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Austria, the last three now joining the European Union) and Switzerland; cooperation between higher education in Western Europe and Central and Eastern Europe through the TEMPUS program; the introduction of a program for cooperation in higher education between the European Union and the United States, the EC/FIPSE program; and similar programs for cooperation with the Maghreb countries around the Mediterranean Sea (MEDCAMPUS) and with Latin America (COLUMBUS/ALFA). ERASMUS has also been the inspiration for similar regional plans without involvement of the European Union, for instance in Asia and NAFTA.

Hence the early fear, on the part of some outside Europe, of the emergence of a "Fortress Europe" in international education has been proved unfounded by a booming number of exchange agreements and programs of cooperation linking institutions of higher education in Europe with counterpart institutions all over the world. These initiatives have in most cases been developed independently of funding from EC or national governments, being based rather on the growing awareness in higher education that the world of science is not limited to Europe.

4. Development Aid programs

Support to the Third World in general, and to higher education in the South in particular, has received much attention in Western Europe. In the Netherlands, for example, in the 1970s and 1980s, internationalisation of higher education was almost exclusively oriented to cooperation with higher education in the developing countries, with financial support from both the national government and the institutions themselves.

This situation changed in the course of the 1980s. As Alan Smith states:

When it comes to the role of the academic community in the context of providing development aid, however, the current situation appears to be much less encouraging. In so far as figures are available, it would appear that support for such activities has tended to stagnate or even recede, and even in the more positive cases growth-rates have tended not to keep pace with those in the area of cooperation between industrialized countries.

The new orientation toward support for higher education in Central and Eastern Europe, and the policy shift of major education funders like the World Bank away from higher education and toward the primary education sector, are among the factors that explain this development. (16) For some parts of the developing world, notably countries of sub-Saharan Africa, the picture is exacerbated by the displacement effect of the transformations in the former Soviet Union and the consequent loss of formerly available study opportunities there.

There are, however, signals that development aid to higher education in the Third World is receiving new attention. At the Annual Conference of the EAIE in December 1993 in The Hague, Colin Power, assistant director for education of UNESCO, reconfirmed the need for international cooperation and assistance by stating that

existing statistics indicate the ever widening gap between the developed and the developing countries in the field of science and technology.

He was supported in his appeal by Ismail Serageldin, vice president of the World Bank, who stated:

Europe, which has given so much to the world, both good and bad, must remain engaged with the rest of the world at this time when the end of the cold war brings both crises and opportunities. It is important that the next generation of Europeans should continue to look beyond their own frontiers, not motivated by dreams of empire or domination, but by the individual and collective enrichment that will come to Europe and the Europeans in recognizing our common humanity in the billions of the poor beyond their borders as well as in the peoples of the competing industrial economies across the world.

The European universities have an important role in this process, as the defender of core values of humanism, tolerance, rationality and reason. (17)

The European Commission has become one of the important international funding organizations for development cooperation in the educational field, alongside

national governments. One fact already becoming clear is that institutions of higher education in Europe wishing to be active in development cooperation will increasingly need to work together in European consortia, instead of acting alone.

5. The General Impact of the EC programs The European programs for exchange and cooperation described above have transformed international mobility from a purely one-way flow, involving very small numbers of unrelated movers, to managed flows involving large numbers under directly related multilateral exchanges at all levels of higher education. One could call this development the external democratization of the international mobility of students, giving students from lower and middle classes and of middle-level qualifications access to study abroad that had once been restricted to the upper classes and a limited number of highly qualified students. To paraphrase Peter Scott in his keynote address given at the third Annual Conference of the EAIE in Montpellier in December 1991: "Student exchanges and international education must be conceived in terms of peoples talking to peoples, not elites talking to elites.... (Student exchange) must become routine, mundane, part of the fabric of everyday academic life" instead of being "exceptional or a privileged process". (18)

Gisela Baumgratz stresses the different road internationalisation has taken, thanks to European programs:

Compared with traditional mobility patterns in Europe and the United States, the programs have introduced a new pattern: limited periods of study abroad forming part of the study course at undergraduate level; educational cooperation and staff exchange alongside the traditional research cooperation: and highly selective postgraduate programs for freemovers. (19)

The response of the institutions of higher education to the EC initiatives was positive but at first rather reactive: "as long as Brussels is giving us money, why should we oppose the idea". As Ladislav Cerych has said,

Community funds are not and never will be available to European higher education to solve its financial problems; they will never cover more than a very small proportion of needs. Misunderstandings and over-expectations in this respect have been and probably remain common among European universities, their staff and their students. (20)

Soon this became clear. Participation in the European programs did not generate income but demanded active involvement and investment on the part of the institutions and departments. This involvement in turn, however, has created a shift from passive response to active involvement. Institutions of higher education, departments, faculty, and students have had to decide what would be the positive effects of participation in the ERASMUS and other schemes and what price they were prepared to pay. Such decisions were traditionally made from the point of view of academic and personal experience. Now, under the schemes, instead of something extra and exceptional, a study abroad experience had to be an integral part of the curriculum. For that reason, exchange of information on the course offerings and levels of study became crucial, as was the development of mechanisms of recognition of courses taken abroad through systems of credit transfer.

For varying reasons and to differing extents, the sending of students and faculty abroad was generally seen as the most important aspect of the exchange programs. That this also entailed the reception of foreign students and faculty was at first seen by many institutions

more as a drawback than an advantage. The reception of foreign students in large numbers confronted institutions of higher education with unforeseen problems, both in the classrooms and in support facilities. Language barriers, different academic backgrounds and academic calendars, housing, and insurance were among the many problems to be solved.

The problems that institutions of higher education are faced with differ by country and type of institution. For example, the United Kingdom is confronted with a high demand of students wishing to spend their study abroad period there, mainly for language reasons. In a recent survey, students of the different countries of the European Union, when asked for their first preference of study abroad-with the exception of U.K. and Irish students (first preference: France) and students from Luxembourg (first preference: Germany mentioned the United Kingdom as their first place of preference. At the same time, higher education in the United Kingdom, for financial reasons, is less keen to receive large numbers of non-fee students from the Continent and also has problems stimulating their own students to participate in the exchange programs with the continent.

Despite these problems, we can now say that ERASMUS and the other EC programs have placed internationalisation high on the priority lists of national, institutional, and departmental strategic plans. Several national governments, private funds, and regional entities have established funds alongside the EC programs to stimulate international cooperation and exchange. Seven years after the creation of ERASMUS, one may say that institutions of higher education in Europe have largely learned to cope with its demands and those of the other EC programs. In many institutions of higher education smaller or larger offices of international relations have been established at the institutional, and frequently also at the departmental, level. With due regard to variation and exceptions, the trend is for institutions to give internationalisation a central place in their mission statements, strategic plans, and budgets. From a move imposed by the outside world, internationalisation is becoming an integral part of higher education policy. Institutions of higher education, faculty, and students are increasingly placing international education at the center of their strategies.

Karl Roeloffs describes the impact in the following way:

The intra-Community programs sponsored from Brussels did not, as was feared, exhaust the potential of systems and institutions for international cooperation on the level of individual member states and their higher education system. One can rather say that initiatives and financial support from Brussels have stimulated motivation and have provided experience and infrastructure for increased activities on the national level and outside the scope of the Community programs. (21)

It is, however, important not to overstate the uniformity of this trend. At the end of this paper we comment on some of the tensions and counterpressures affecting the picture. The danger still exists, to quote Peter Scott again, that international education will be "regarded as an optional activity, an add-on at the periphery of higher education and research," where it should be "at the core of the curriculum". (22)

3. Conclusions and Directions for

Because of the complexity and diversity of the European situation with regard to higher education, and the systemic changes in progress at all levels, some of whose long-term

effects are hard to predict, it is not possible to draw for Europe a simple model of uniform progress toward internationalisation. Some broad trends, however, can be discerned.

1. Future Trends

1. Among the trends in internationalization in Europe, we stress the following:

A broad tendency for strategies for internationalisation that have in the past been tacit, fragmented, and ad hoc to become explicit, managed, and coordinated. This tendency is more marked in Northern than in Southern Europe. In Central and Eastern Europe, this process manifests itself more in a reform of the old highly centralized and controlled central policies and their transformation into a more open and autonomous structure.

. The gradual development of a more interactive model of internationalisation, with policy decisions, support systems, and organizational structures located at both central and decentralized levels, and with flexible connections between these levels.

A gradual change from a reactive response to EC and national programs and funds for internationalisation to a more autonomous, proactive policy of internationalisation. at both the institutional and the departmental levels.

. Alongside the above, a gradual diversification of resources for internationalisation, combining EC and national with institutional and private funds.

. More attention to networking on a multilateral and structural basis, in research, curriculum development, and delivery.

. An increasing professionalization of those with responsibility for international activities in institutions. This again is more marked in the North than the South of Europe, and may have negative as well as positive results, since there is a danger that international activity may become 'ghettoised' rather than integral to the life of the institution.

. An increasing priority being given by Western European institutions to strategies for cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe and the rest of the world: globalization of international cooperation, in response and in addition to the process of (Western) Europeanization, as stimulated by the European Commission.

. A growing awareness of the importance of the academic aspects of internationalisation, such as curriculum development, credit transfer, and research training.

. A growing recognition of the value of effective procedures for evaluation, monitoring, and quality assurance with respect to international activity.

2. Potential Counterpressures and Tensions

Set against these trends, certain counterpressures and tensions need also to be noted, among them the following:

. The tension between incentives to internationalize, and the rationales for cultivating

a distinctive institutional and national identity; resistance to what has been called the 'denationalizing' effect of internationalisation .

. Linked to the above, the emergence within Europe of a new 'localism: an assertion of local and regional identities in other spheres as well as education. Cross-border cooperation at institutional level, which is an emerging pattern in some areas, combines elements of 'internationalism' and 'regionalism'. At present it is impossible to predict what accommodations there will be between these new groupings and the centralizing forces in Europe, such as the competencies of the EU.

. The cost-benefit balance of international activity, with regard to both the institution and the individual.

. The proliferation of different types of institutions, the expansion of new sectors and specialisms, and the growth in numbers of private-sector institutions seeking an international presence in Europe. These developments present challenges to the more established institutions, authorities and policy-making structures, whose outcome cannot at present be clearly foreseen.

3. Comparison Between European and American Developments

It is not the objective of this article to describe in detail the differences in developments in internationalisation of higher education in Europe and the United States. Following are some general differences for further debate:

. Internationalisation of higher education, immediately after the Second World War, was more dominant in the United States, based on arguments of foreign policy and national security. In Europe the tradition is still rather young and became more important only as part of the European economic and political integration process and was primarily motivated by arguments of economic competition. At the same time, many older European universities regard themselves as belonging to a deep-rooted tradition as international institutions.

. In the United States, the objective of internationalisation strategies, at both the government and the institutional levels, is more directed to global and intercultural awareness, in response to cultural parochialism, whereas in Europe the accent is more on the extension and diversification of academic performance.

. In the United States, for that reason, the emphasis in study abroad activities is on undergraduate mobility, whereas in Europe exchanges at the graduate level have more priority.

. The focus of internationalisation strategies in the United States is more directed to globalization of the curriculum, area studies, and foreign language study, whereas in Europe the focus is more on networking and mobility.

. In the United States, study abroad and foreign student advising tend to be seen more as two different, unrelated activities, whereas in Europe they are seen as related parts of mobility schemes, with the emphasis on exchanges.

. In the United States, study abroad tends to take the form of faculty supervised group

mobility, whereas in Europe mobility is based more on mutual trust and is individual oriented.

Possible explanations for these differences are the following:

. In the United States, internationalisation is seen as part of general education, whereas in Europe it is seen as more an activity within academic specialization.

. In the United States, undergraduate education has to compensate for the lack of global and intercultural education and foreign language training in primary and secondary education. In higher education, this takes the form of international education. In Europe, general education, including global and intercultural education and, at least in some countries, active foreign language training are an integral part of primary and secondary education. Higher education can undergo internationalisation more as an integrated part of academic specialization.

. In the United States, area studies, foreign language training, the study of international relations, and development studies are externally added and sponsored programs, whereas in Europe they have developed as regular disciplines, not different from others such as law, economics, and medicine.

We have to add that the differences in internationalisation strategies in recent years have become less explicit, with movements on both sides in each other's direction.

4. **Concluding Observations** Finally, we offer two concluding observations with respect to the analysis of institutional strategies for internationalisation in European higher education, as presented in this report and other publications.

First, we cannot repeat enough that it is extremely difficult to make generalisations in the analysis of internationalisation, valid for Europe as a whole. General overviews of developments in Europe do not give sufficient credit to the complexity of Europe, in particular its regional and national differences. This report itself has a certain Western European, and even North Western European, bias, giving insufficient attention to the specific conditions in Southern, Central, and Eastern Europe. There is still a long way to go in the direction of studies on internationalisation and of internationalisation of higher education in itself, that reflects the diversity and cultural pluralism in Europe.

Second, any analysis of internationalisation is faced with the lack of a research tradition in this area in Europe, in particular with respect to the institutional aspects and to the effects of internationalisation. Many reports have been published about the programs for internationalisation in the European Union, but few about the process of internationalisation as institutional strategy.